

OITS-546

June 1994 (revised)

EXCLUSIVE AND SEMI-INCLUSIVE B DECAYS
 BASED ON $b \rightarrow s \eta_c$ TRANSITION

N. G. DESHPANDE¹ and JOSIP TRAMPETIC²

¹*Institute of Theoretical Science, University of Oregon,
 Eugene, OR 97403-5203, U.S.A.*

²*Department of Theoretical Physics, R. Bošković Institute,
 P.O.Box 1016, 41001 Zagreb, Croatia*

ABSTRACT

We calculate the semi-inclusive processes $B \rightarrow X_s \eta_c$ and relate it to $B \rightarrow X_s \psi$ in next to leading order QCD, and show how it can be used to determine an accurate value of f_{η_c} . The exclusive modes $B \rightarrow K \eta_c$ and $B \rightarrow K \psi$ also yield similar results, whereas $B \rightarrow K^* \eta_c$ and $B \rightarrow K^* \psi$ can provide valuable information on hadronic form factors. We also estimate the branching ratios and the ratios of exclusive to inclusive decay modes dominated by $b \rightarrow s \eta_c$.

The $b \rightarrow s\eta_c$ transition offers a unique opportunity to test our understanding of B meson decays. The related process $b \rightarrow s\psi$ is known to give the ratio for semi-inclusive decays of B, $B \rightarrow \psi + \text{anything}$ to exclusive decays $B \rightarrow K\psi$ and $B \rightarrow K^*\psi$, in fair agreement with data [1]. Here we show that by taking the ratio of processes involving η_c to those involving ψ , one can remove the model dependence to a large extent, and have an independent and powerful way of determining f_{η_c} , the pseudoscalar decay constant of η_c , the S_0 state of the charmonium.

The weak Hamiltonian, corrected to the next to leading order (NLO) in QCD, relevant for us is given by [2,3]

$$H_{\Delta B=1}^{\Delta S=-1} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \left[\sum_{q=u,c} V_{qb}V_{qs}^* (c_1 O_1^q + c_2 O_2^q) - V_{tb}V_{ts}^* \sum_{i=3}^6 c_i O_i \right] + h.c., \quad (1)$$

where c_i are the Wilson coefficients and O_i are the operators:

$$O_1^q = \bar{s}_i \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma_5) b_j \bar{q}_j \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma_5) q_i, \quad O_2^q = \bar{s}_i \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma_5) b_i \bar{q}_j \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma_5) q_j, \quad (2)$$

$$O_3 = \bar{s}_i \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma_5) b_i \sum_{q'} \bar{q}'_j \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) q'_j, \quad O_4 = \bar{s}_i \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma_5) b_j \sum_q \bar{q}'_j \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) q'_i, \quad (3)$$

$$O_5 = \bar{s}_i \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma_5) b_i \sum_{q'} \bar{q}'_j \gamma_\mu (1 + \gamma_5) q'_j, \quad O_6 = \bar{s}_i \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma_5) b_j \sum_{q'} \bar{q}'_j \gamma_\mu (1 + \gamma_5) q'_i. \quad (4)$$

The values of the Wilson coefficients at the scale $\mu \cong m_b$, for

$$m_b = 4.8 \text{ GeV}, \quad \Lambda_{\overline{MS}} = 250 \text{ MeV}, \quad m_{top} = 150 \text{ GeV}, \quad (5)$$

are [2]:

$$\begin{aligned}
c_1 &= 1.133, \quad c_2 = -0.291, \quad c_3 = 0.015, \\
c_4 &= -0.034, \quad c_5 = -0.010, \quad c_6 = -0.042.
\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

We now define the matrix elements

$$\langle 0 | \bar{c} \gamma_\mu c | \psi(q) \rangle = i \varepsilon_\mu(q) g_\psi, \quad \langle 0 | \bar{c} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 c | \eta_c(q) \rangle = i q_\mu f_{\eta_c}, \tag{7}$$

where $g_\psi^2 = (1.414 \pm 0.083) \text{ GeV}^4$ from $\psi \rightarrow e^+ e^-$ [4]. The pseudoscalar decay constant f_{η_c} is expected to be $\approx 350 \text{ MeV}$, based on potential models, but the exact value is not known. The effective Hamiltonians in momentum space for the two decays are

$$H_{eff}^{b \rightarrow s \psi} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} |V_{cs}^* V_{cb}| |C_\psi| g_\psi \varepsilon_\psi^\mu(q) \bar{s}_i(k) \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) b_i(p), \tag{8}$$

$$H_{eff}^{b \rightarrow s \eta_c} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} |V_{cs}^* V_{cb}| |C_{\eta_c}| f_{\eta_c} q^\mu \bar{s}_i(k) \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) b_i(p), \tag{9}$$

where

$$C_\psi = c_2 + c_3 + c_5 + \frac{1}{N_c} (c_1 + c_4 + c_6), \tag{10}$$

$$C_{\eta_c} = c_2 + c_3 - c_5 + \frac{1}{N_c} (c_1 + c_4 - c_6). \tag{11}$$

We shall treat C_ψ and C_{η_c} as a phenomenological parameters, thus absorbing in their definition any higher-order correction or deviation from factorization that may arise [1]. The value of $|C_\psi|$ determined from $BR(B \rightarrow X_s \psi) = (1 \pm 0.25) \times 10^{-2}$ [5], where we have corrected for the fact that not all ψ 's are produced directly but arise from cascades of ψ' 's, etc., is

$$|C_\psi| = 0.220 \pm 0.026. \tag{12}$$

This value of $|C_\psi|$ favors $N_c \cong 2$. We note that the ratio $|C_{\eta_c}/C_\psi|$ is one in leading order. In the NLO, with the QCD coefficients from Ref's [2] and/or [3], for the $2 \leq N_c \leq 3$ and $m_t = 174 \pm 25$ GeV the ratio is stable within the following values:

$$|C_{\eta_c}/C_\psi| = 0.89 \pm 0.02. \quad (13)$$

The ratio of semi-inclusive ψ production to η_c production can now be easily calculated. We find that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Gamma(B \rightarrow X_s \eta_c)}{\Gamma(B \rightarrow X_s \psi)} &\equiv \frac{\Gamma(b \rightarrow s \eta_c)}{\Gamma(b \rightarrow s \psi)} = \left| f_{\eta_c} \frac{C_{\eta_c}}{C_\psi} \right|^2 \left(\frac{m_\psi}{g_\psi} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\lambda_{s\eta_c}^b}{\lambda_{s\psi}^b} \right)^{1/2} \\ &\times \frac{[(m_b^2 - m_s^2)^2 - m_{\eta_c}^2(m_b^2 + m_s^2)]}{[m_b^2(m_b^2 + m_\psi^2) - m_s^2(2m_b^2 - m_\psi^2) + m_s^4 - 2m_\psi^4]} \\ &\cong 4.0(\text{GeV}^{-2}) \left| f_{\eta_c} \frac{C_{\eta_c}}{C_\psi} \right|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where

$$\lambda_{bc}^a = \left(1 - \frac{m_b^2}{m_a^2} - \frac{m_c^2}{m_a^2} \right)^2 - 4 \frac{m_b^2 m_c^2}{m_a^4}.$$

Measurements of this hadron-model independent ratio offers a very accurate determination of f_{η_c} . In ratio (14), again only the direct η_c production should be included. Since the cascade of charmonia into η_c is extremely small, no correction is necessary.

Next we consider the $B \rightarrow K\psi$ and $B \rightarrow K\eta_c$ modes. Using the general Lorentz decomposition of the matrix element

$$\langle K(k) | \bar{s} \gamma_\mu b | B(p) \rangle = (p+k)_\mu f_{KB}^{(+)}(q^2) + q_\mu f_{KB}^{(-)}(q^2), \quad (15)$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Gamma(B \rightarrow K\eta_c)}{\Gamma(B \rightarrow K\psi)} &= \left| f_{\eta_c} \frac{C_{\eta_c}}{C_\psi} \right|^2 \left(\frac{m_\psi}{g_\psi} \right)^2 \frac{(\lambda_{K\eta_c}^B)^{1/2}}{(\lambda_{K\psi}^B)^{3/2}} \left| f_{KB}^{(+)}(m_\psi^2) \right|^{-2} \\ &\times \left| \left(1 - \frac{m_K^2}{m_B^2} \right) f_{KB}^{(+)}(m_{\eta_c}^2) + \frac{m_{\eta_c}^2}{m_B^2} f_{KB}^{(-)}(m_{\eta_c}^2) \right|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Since $m_\psi \cong m_{\eta_c}$, we have set $f_{KB}^{(+)}(m_{\eta_c}^2)/f_{KB}^{(+)}(m_\psi^2) \cong 1$. The second term in Eq.16 is $\left[m_{\eta_c}^2/m_B^2 \right] \left[f_{KB}^{(-)}(m_{\eta_c}^2)/f_{KB}^{(+)}(m_{\eta_c}^2) \right] \cong -0.06$, and it is negligible compared with the first term in (16), in accord with the pole approximation as discussed in [6]. Because of that, essentially hadron-model independent, ratio (16) is:

$$\Gamma(B \rightarrow K\eta_c)/\Gamma(B \rightarrow K\psi) \cong 14.2(\text{GeV}^{-2}) \left| f_{\eta_c} \frac{C_{\eta_c}}{C_\psi} \right|^2. \quad (17)$$

Finally, we calculate the exclusive rates for $B \rightarrow K^*\psi$ and $B \rightarrow K^*\eta_c$. The general Lorentz decomposition of the $(B \rightarrow K^*)$ matrix element:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle K^*(k) | \bar{s} \gamma_\mu (1 - \gamma_5) b | B(p) \rangle &= -i \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda\sigma} (p+k)^\nu (p-k)^\lambda \varepsilon^\sigma(k) V \\ &+ \varepsilon(k) (m_B^2 - m_{K^*}^2) A_1 - (q \cdot \varepsilon(k)) (p+k)_\mu A_2 \\ &+ (q \cdot \varepsilon(k)) (m_B + m_{K^*}) (q_\mu/q^2) [2m_{K^*} A_0 - (m_B - m_{K^*}) (A_1 - A_2)], \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

and the corresponding definitions of relevant form-factors

$$V = \frac{V(q^2)}{(m_B + m_{K^*})}, \quad V(q^2) = \frac{V(0)}{(1 - q^2/m_{1-}^2)} \quad (19)$$

$$A_0 = \frac{A_0(q^2)}{(m_B + m_{K^*})}, \quad A_0(q^2) = \frac{A_0(0)}{(1 - q^2/m_{0-}^2)} \quad (20)$$

$$A_1 = \frac{A_1(q^2)}{(m_B - m_{K^*})}, \quad A_1(q^2) = \frac{A_1(0)}{(1 - q^2/m_{1+}^2)} \quad (21)$$

$$A_2 = \frac{A_2(q^2)}{(m_B + m_{K^*})}, \quad A_2(q^2) = \frac{A_2(0)}{(1 - q^2/m_{1+}^2)} \quad (22)$$

$$A_0(0) = \frac{m_B + m_{K^*}}{2m_{K^*}} A_1(0) - \frac{m_B - m_{K^*}}{2m_{K^*}} A_2(0), \quad (23)$$

gives the hadron-model dependent ratio

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Gamma(B \rightarrow K^* \eta_c)}{\Gamma(B \rightarrow K^* \psi)} &= \left| f_{\eta_c} \frac{C_{\eta_c}}{C_\psi} \right|^2 \left(\frac{m_B + m_{K^*}}{g_\psi} \right)^2 \left(\frac{\lambda_{K^* \eta_c}^B}{\lambda_{K^* \psi}^B} \right)^{3/2} |A_0|^2 \\ &\times \left[2|V|^2 + \left(\frac{3}{\lambda_{K^* \psi}^B} + \frac{m_B^4}{4m_{K^*}^2 m_\psi^2} \right) \left(1 - \frac{m_{K^*}^2}{m_B^2} \right)^2 |A_1|^2 + \right. \\ &+ \left(\frac{m_B^4}{4m_{K^*}^2 m_\psi^2} \right) \lambda_{K^* \psi}^B |A_2|^2 - \\ &\left. - \left(\frac{m_B^4}{2m_{K^*}^2 m_\psi^2} \right) \left(1 - \frac{m_\psi^2}{m_B^2} - \frac{m_{K^*}^2}{m_B^2} \right) \left(1 - \frac{m_{K^*}^2}{m_B^2} \right) A_1 A_2 \right]^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

The ratio (24) can be represented as

$$\Gamma(B \rightarrow K^* \eta_c)/\Gamma(B \rightarrow K^* \psi) = R(\text{GeV}^{-2}) \left| f_{\eta_c} \frac{C_{\eta_c}}{C_\psi} \right|^2. \quad (25)$$

The factor R depends critically on the form factors. We evaluate it in three models for illustration. The first is the relativistic quark model, Model 1, [7]. For Model 2, we use a parametrization based on effective chiral theory for mesons with flavor and spin symmetries of Heavy Quark Effective Theory [HQET] [8,9]. This method contains errors that follow from semileptonic D-meson decays used as inputs [10]. The Model 3 is a variation [11],

where $A_2(0)$ is set equal to zero and $V(0)$ is renormalized from the value in Ref.[7]. Last model gives a much better fit to experimental measurements of Γ_L/Γ_{T+L} ratio, where $\Gamma_{L(T)}$ refers to the longitudinal(transvers) polarization of ψ mesons in $B \rightarrow K^*\psi$ decay. This ratio is also very sensitive to the form factors. All models use the single pole fits for V and A_i , ($i=0,1,2$) form factors. The masses of excited meson states, corresponding to the $\bar{s}b$ current, are: $m_{0-} = 5.38$, $m_{1-} = 5.43$, $m_{0+} = 5.89$ and $m_{1+} = 5.82$, GeV's. In Table 1 we summarise the parameters (V, A_i) and the factor R for $B \rightarrow K^*(\psi, \eta_c)$ decays, while the ratios Γ_L/Γ_{T+L} , Γ_T/Γ_{T+L} are given for $B \rightarrow K^*\psi$ decay.

Table 1

The (V, A_i), R , Γ_L/Γ_{T+L} and Γ_T/Γ_{T+L} in Models 1, 2, 3 and 1', 2'.

Model [Ref.]	$V(0)$	$A_0(0)$	$A_1(0)$	$A_2(0)$	R (GeV^{-2})	Γ_L/Γ_{T+L}	Γ_T/Γ_{T+L}
1 [7]	0.369	0.321	0.328	0.331	1.01	0.573	0.427
2 [8,9]	0.61	0.20	0.20	0.20	0.67	0.366	0.634
3 [11]	0.656	1.133	0.328	0.0	5.49	0.728	0.272
1'	0.37	1.13	0.33	0.0	6.0	0.80	0.20
2'	0.61	0.69	0.20	0.0	4.7	0.63	0.37

The experimental value of Γ_L/Γ_{T+L} is:

$$\frac{\Gamma_L(B \rightarrow K^*\psi)}{\Gamma_{T+L}(B \rightarrow K^*\psi)} = \begin{cases} 0.80 \pm 0.05_{-0.08}^{+0.08} & , [12] \\ 0.66 \pm 0.10_{-0.10}^{+0.08} & . [13] \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

Note that if the condition $A_2(0) = 0$ is put by hand in Models 1 and 2, we find $\Gamma_L/\Gamma_{T+L} \cong 0.80$ and 0.63 , respectively. In Table 1 we call these models 1' and 2'. Measurement of $D \rightarrow K^*l\nu$ decay [10] favors $A_2(0) \cong 0$, and HQET relates $(B \rightarrow K^*)$ to $(D \rightarrow K^*)$ transition [11].

As a by-product of the above analysis and using recent CLEO II experimental results on the $B \rightarrow K^*\psi$ and $B \rightarrow K\psi$ decays [12]:

$$BR(B^- \rightarrow K^{*-}\psi) = (0.178 \pm 0.051 \pm 0.023) \times 10^{-2}, \quad (27)$$

$$BR(B^0 \rightarrow K^{*0}\psi) = (0.169 \pm 0.031 \pm 0.018) \times 10^{-2}, \quad (28)$$

$$BR(B^- \rightarrow K^-\psi) = (0.110 \pm 0.015 \pm 0.009) \times 10^{-2}, \quad (29)$$

$$BR(B^0 \rightarrow K^0\psi) = (0.075 \pm 0.024 \pm 0.008) \times 10^{-2}, \quad (30)$$

from the expressions,

$$\frac{\Gamma(B \rightarrow X_s\eta_c)}{\Gamma(B \rightarrow X_s\psi)} = \frac{4.0}{R} \frac{\Gamma(B \rightarrow K^*\eta_c)}{\Gamma(B \rightarrow K^*\psi)}, \quad (31)$$

$$\frac{\Gamma(B \rightarrow X_s\eta_c)}{\Gamma(B \rightarrow X_s\psi)} = \frac{4.0}{14.2} \frac{\Gamma(B \rightarrow K\eta_c)}{\Gamma(B \rightarrow K\psi)}, \quad (32)$$

we estimate the ratios of exclusive to inclusive decay modes:

$$\Gamma(B^- \rightarrow K^{*-}\eta_c)/\Gamma(B \rightarrow X_s\eta_c) = R(0.045 \pm 0.018), \quad (33)$$

$$\Gamma(B^0 \rightarrow K^{*0}\eta_c)/\Gamma(B \rightarrow X_s\eta_c) = R(0.042 \pm 0.014), \quad (34)$$

$$\Gamma(B^- \rightarrow K^- \eta_c)/\Gamma(B \rightarrow X_s \eta_c) = 0.391 \pm 0.116, \quad (35)$$

$$\Gamma(B^0 \rightarrow K^0 \eta_c)/\Gamma(B \rightarrow X_s \eta_c) = 0.266 \pm 0.112. \quad (36)$$

The above estimates reflect the experimental errors from (27) to (30). Theoretically, the ratios in (33) and (34) have to be equal, as also (35) and (36). If one uses the values of R from models based on $A_2(0)=0$, then $\Gamma(B \rightarrow K^* \eta_c)$ is $\cong 25\%$ of the inclusive rate. This seems to be surprisingly large because it would imply that $B \rightarrow K \eta_c$ and $B \rightarrow K^* \eta_c$ predominantly saturate transition $B \rightarrow X_s \eta_c$!

To estimate branching ratios for $B \rightarrow K^* \eta_c$, $B \rightarrow K \eta_c$ and $B \rightarrow X_s \eta_c$ decays one has to know the pseudoscalar decay constant f_{η_c} . Theoretically, like the value of g_ψ , the value of f_{η_c} can be related to the wave function of the S -state of the charmonium at the origin:

$$g_\psi^2 = 12m_\psi |\psi(0)|^2, \quad (37)$$

$$f_{\eta_c}^2 = 48 \frac{m_c^2}{m_{\eta_c}^3} |\psi(0)|^2. \quad (38)$$

Without QCD corrections the expressions (37,38) gives $f_{\eta_c} \cong 350$ MeV. The QCD corrections are significant but approximately cancel in the ratio [14], and one expects f_{η_c} to be close to the above value.

A non-perturbative estimate of f_{η_c} based on QCD sum rules [15] could be more reliable. Saturating vacuum polarization of pseudoscalar density evaluated to $O(\alpha_s)$ with m_{η_c} , $m_{\eta_c'}$ and using $n=4,5$ moments, which minimize the continuum contributions, we find

$$f_{\eta_c} = (300 \pm 50) MeV. \quad (39)$$

The major source of error above is not $\alpha_s(m_{\eta_c}) = 0.212 \pm 0.021$, but the current quark mass of charm which we take as $m_c = (1.25 \pm 0.03) \text{ GeV}$.

Using the central value of $f_{\eta_c} = 300 \text{ MeV}$, and taking the ratio $|C_{\eta_c}/C_\psi| = 0.89$, we estimate branching ratios for $B \rightarrow K^*\eta_c$, $K\eta_c$ and $X_s\eta_c$ decays:

$$BR(B^- \rightarrow K^{*-}\eta_c) = R(0.127 \pm 0.040) \times 10^{-3}, \quad (40)$$

$$BR(B^0 \rightarrow K^{*0}\eta_c) = R(0.121 \pm 0.026) \times 10^{-3}, \quad (41)$$

$$BR(B^- \rightarrow K^-\eta_c) = (1.113 \pm 0.177) \times 10^{-3}, \quad (42)$$

$$BR(B^0 \rightarrow K^0\eta_c) = (0.759 \pm 0.256) \times 10^{-3}, \quad (43)$$

$$BR(B \rightarrow X_s\eta_c) = (2.851 \pm 0.713) \times 10^{-3}. \quad (44)$$

To conclude, we have shown a very accurate technique of measuring f_{η_c} . The consistency of this value obtained from semi-inclusive decays and exclusive decays will check factorization. Once f_{η_c} is known from the measurements of $B \rightarrow X_s\eta_c$, this can be used to see if the form-factor ratio (24) is consistent with models of those decays. The measurement of $B \rightarrow K^*\eta_c$ probes the spin-0 part of the axial form factor, and provides a useful check on the model building. Finally, we estimated branching ratios and the ratios of exclusive to inclusive decays for the most interesting modes.

This work was supported in part by the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract DE-FG06-85ER40224, and by the Croatian Ministry of Research under Contract 1-03-199.

References

- [1] K. Berkelman, "Hadronic Decays - Experiment",
p.136 in B-Decays, ed. by: S. Stone, World Scientific, 1992;
N.G. Deshpande, J. Trampetić, and K. Panose,
Phys. Lett. B214, 467 (1988).
- [2] A.J. Buras, M. Jamin, M.E. Lautenbacher and P.H. Weisz,
Nucl. Phys. B370, 69 (1992).
- [3] N.G. Deshpande, Xiao-Gang He, OITS-538 preprint (1994)
- [4] Review of Particle Properties, Phys. Rev. D45, II.18 (1992).
- [5] N.G. Deshpande, J. Trampetic and K. Panose,
Phys. Lett. B214, 467 (1988).
- [6] J.G. Körner, K. Schilcher, M. Wilber and Y.L. Wu,
Z.Phys. C48, 663 (1990).
- [7] M. Wirbel, B. Stech and M. Bauer, Z.Phys. C29, 637 (1985),
M. Bauer, B. Stech and M. Wirbel, Z.Phys. C34, 103 (1987).
- [8] R. Casalbuoni, A. Deandrea, N. Di Bartolomeo, F. Feruglio,
R. Gatto and G. Narduli, Phys. Lett. B299, 139 (1993) .
- [9] A. Deandrea, N. Di Bartolomeo, R. Gatto and G. Narduli,
Phys. Lett. B318, 549 (1993).

- [10] J.C. Anjos et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 65, 2630 (1990).
- [11] G. Kramer, T. Mannel and G.A. Schuler, Z.Phys. C51, 649 (1991)
- [12] T.E. Browder, K. Honscheid and S. Playfer,
"A Review of Hadronic and Rare B Decays",
(To appear in B-Decays, 2nd edition, Ed. by S. Stone, World Scientific);
CLEO Collaboration, M.S. Alam et al., CLNS 94-1270, CLEO 94-5.
- [13] CDF Collaboration, FERMILAB-CONF-94/127-E
- [14] W. Kwong, J.L. Rosner and C. Quigg,
Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. 37, 325-382 (1987).
- [15] L.J. Reinders, H.R. Rubinstein and S. Yazaki,
Phys. Lett. B94, 203 (1980);
L.J. Reinders, H.R. Rubinstein and S. Yazaki,
Phys. Reports 127, 1-97 (1985).